

Remarks

Summary

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 were pending. In the present response, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 16-20, 22-24, 35-37, 39-40, 50-51, 53-55, and 64-67 have been amended. No claims are cancelled or added. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 remain pending and under consideration.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during a June 3, 2010, telephonic interview during which the outstanding rejections were discussed. No specific agreement was reached, but clarifying amendments to the independent claims were discussed to avoid misinterpretation of the term "locator." As discussed, the term "locator" in the present claims is a "valid locator" of an "information page" whereas in Risley (US 6,332,158), the misspelled locator causes a redirect to a temporary page because of the improperly identified domain/locator. Thus, the misspelled locator is not a "valid locator." The Examiner indicated that such an amendment appeared to overcome Risley. Applicants' further record of the substance of the interview is embodied in the remarks below.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-18, 35-49, and 67 were rejected under 35 USC 101. The claims have been amended herein thus obviating the rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10-20, 22, 23, 25-40, 42-54, and 56-67 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over US Patent No. 6,332,158 to Risley. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections in light of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below.

Risley provides a system for looking up domain names and correcting erroneous domain names. If a requested domain name does not exist, a recommendation engine

analyzes the requested domain name for potential misspellings, phonetic errors, sub-domain errors, past-statistics on website access, etc. The system redirects the request to a temporary webpage on which recommendations are displayed for other sites that may have been intended by the user.

Thus, Risley provides suggestions of accurate domain names when a request is made for access to a domain name that does not exist. Claim 1 is, however, directed to “identifying a plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page” And, claim 1 recites “determining by a computing device based at least in part on content of a valid locator of a first information page” These recitations clearly indicate that the “locator of the first information page” is a “valid locator” that directs the system to an actual “information page” and the “complementary or related information ... amplifies information of the first information page” In interpreting Risley, the Office Action defines the locator of Risley as the erroneously requested domain and the first information page is identified as the temporary page that is displayed to provide recommendations on proper domain names. Thus, in Risley the locator is not a “valid locator of a first information page.”

In addition to the above, Risley does not suggest the use or modification of a “valid locator” because the system in Risley would no longer function as designed. Risley is specifically designed to provide alternative domains/URLs when a user misidentifies a domain/URL. Thus, a core feature of Risley is the submission of an invalid locator. Furthermore, it does not appear that Risley could be properly combined with another reference, if such a reference taught/suggested the use of a valid locator, as such a combination with Risley simply would not work as intended.

Risley also does not analyze “a pattern of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern, each pre-specified locator pattern identifying a plurality of additional valid locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page, the analyzing including comparing the locator pattern against a

plurality of pre-specified locator patterns,” as recited in claim 1. In particular, there are no “pre-specified URL patterns” in Risley as defined in claim 1.

The Office Action indicates the “locator pattern” is the misspelled URL and indicates that the “pre-specified locator patterns” are the correctly spelled URLs. If that is the standing interpretation of Risley, then “each pre-specified locator pattern” does not identify a “plurality of additional locators” as recited in claim 1. Rather, each pattern (properly spelled URL) would point to a single location. For this additional reason, claim 1 is distinguished over Risley as Risley does not teach or suggest this feature as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Risley fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over Risley.

Independent claims 19, 35, 50, and 64-67 recite similar elements to those of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 19, 35, 50, and 64-67 are patentable over Risley.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 10-18, 20, 22, 23, 25-34, 36-40, 42-49, 51-54, and 56-63 depend from claims 1, 19, 35, and 50 incorporating their elements, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons above, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 5, 10-18, 20, 22, 23, 25-34, 36-40, 42-49, 51-54, and 56-63 are patentable over Risley.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 6, 24, 41, and 55

Claims 6, 24, 41, and 55 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Risley in view of US Patent No. 6,654,741 to Cohen. Claims 6, 24, 41, and 55 are dependent, indirectly, on claims 1, 19, 35, and 50 and thus are patentable over Risley for at least the same reasons discussed above. Cohen fails to overcome the deficiencies of Risley. Thus, claims 6, 24, 41, and 55 are patentable over Risley in view of Cohen for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claim 7

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Risley in view of Cohen and further in view of US Patent No. 6,094,665 to Lyons. Claim 7 is dependent on claim 6 and thus is

patentable over Risley and Cohen for at least the same reasons discussed above. Lyons fails to overcome the deficiencies of Risley and Cohen. Thus, claim 7 is patentable over Risley in view of Cohen and further in view of Lyons for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Risley in view of Lyons. Claim 8 is dependent on claim 5 and thus is patentable over Risley for at least the same reasons discussed above. Lyons fails to overcome the deficiencies of Risley. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Risley in view of Lyons for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2844. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: July 7, 2010

by: /Steven J. Prewitt/
Steven J. Prewitt
Reg. No.: 45,023

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981